

### **REMARKS**

Claims 5, 8-10, 18, 19, and 23-30 are pending in the application. Claims 26-30 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0102500, specifically at paragraph [0027] and in Figures 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 101**

**The Office Action rejected claims 26-30 under USC 101** as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 26 through 30 have been amended to reflect the non-transitory nature of the computer-readable storage medium and thus placing it outside transitory embodiments disallowed by 35 U.S.C. §101. *See also MPEP 2011.01*. Applicant further submits that as applied to claims 26 through 30, non-transitory computer-readable media comprises all computer-readable media.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103**

**The Office Action rejected claims 5, 8-10, 18-19, and 23-30 under 35 USC 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Lerner (US 6,954,799 B2) in view of Cocotis et al. (US Pub 2003/007896500) and Belfiore et al. (Patent No. 6990513 B2) ("Belfiore"). Application respectfully traverses this rejection and submits the following in consideration thereof:

Lerner does not disclose Applicant's claim 5 limitation with respect to "receiving high level business data from a source application program." Rather, Lerner's invention is

directed at receiving browser cookies from a client-driven web browser (used as a term of art to refer to simple text used for user authentication). *See* Lerner's col. 6, lines 29-63 (i.e: *cookie files are...passed from the client web browser to the web application and application interface library function then calls cookie access library functions from the cookie access library to read the data in the cookie and if the cookie to be read is decrypted, the cookie is first decrypted by the encryption/decryption engine*). Thus, the Examiner's cited Lerner passage does not teach or disclose the Applicant's limitations with regards to "high level business data" – data that is directly related to "accounting, payroll, manufacturing and distribution" and which the Applicant envisions being shared among enterprise applications. *See* Applicant's paragraphs [0007 – 0008]. Thus, Applicant's claim limitation regarding "high level business data" is clearly distinguished from Lerner's "cookie data" (i.e: Lerner's col. 11, lines 55-65) both by the Applicant's specification definition and by a plain language reading of the words "high level business data." For these reasons, Lerner also does not teach or disclose the Applicant's claimed limitation regarding "encoding the high level business data."

Additionally, Lerner's patented placing of a queue inside "of a message queuing middleware" (see Lerner, col. 15, lines 40-43) and its Specification's placing of the message queuing middleware within a central server (see Lerner, FIG. 7) is in clear contrast to the Applicant's placing of a *separate* MQ server which is disposed between the Server acting as a hub for an enterprise application integration system and the firewall that separates the LAN from the Internet. (*see* Applicant's paragraph [0017]). Thus, the Applicant's claimed limitation regarding the placement of the message queue in a separate server is distinguished from Lerner's

placement within a central server. Thus, because Lerner does not disclose or suggest the placing of a message queue separate from a central server, Lerner's disclosed matter does not (and in fact cannot) cover the Applicant's limitation with regards to "using the MQ server for processing of the high level business data when received." It is crucial to understand that Lerner envisions the processing of all data by a central server given that the Message Queuing Middleware (see FIG. 3, 370) is within the "central server terminal". See Lerner, col. 7, lines 50 – 55. This is a fundamentally different idea than that espoused in the Specification by Applicant in paragraphs [0017] – [0019] and claimed by the limitations in Claim 5, given that message queuing is performed by a *separate MQ server, and not, as Lerner describes* a message queuing "middleware" (*i.e.: software that connects software components or applications*)

Further, Lerner does not teach nor include Applicant's claim 5 includes a limitation regarding "transmitting, via the Internet using HTTP" the *encrypted message*. In fact, Lerner makes no mention of "HTTP" and none are in the context of encrypted communications, rather they are directed at describing standard web browser communication (*i.e.: "HTTP request" or "HTTP redirect"*). See Lerner at col. 11, lines 46 – 55 and col. 12, lines 5 – 14). Significantly however, Applicant's encrypted MQ message can either be encrypted using HTTPS (see Applicant's paragraph [0025] or Secure Socket Layer (SSL) (see Applicant's paragraph [0020]).

Applicant further submits that Cocotis does not teach or disclose the limitation "wherein the high level business data passes through a first DMZ and a second DMZ zone in order to reach the MQ server." This is so because the pass-through of the data through the DMZs described is achieved through the prior Claim 5 limitation of "transmitting, via the

Internet using HTTP and MQ Series Internet Passthrough (MQ IPT), the encrypted MQ message to a the MQ server. Importantly, Cocotis discusses firewall pass-through *only through the use of a VPN proxy* switch (i.e., “routes the communications through a VPN switch that provides a secure pass-through through a firewall”). No such switch or VPN is claimed by Applicant. Instead, the encapsulation of data within HTTPS or SSL wrappers allows the data to pass unimpeded through a firewall (see Applicant’s paragraph [0022] and paragraph [0026]). It is also worth noting that the motivation of the invention is not as the Examiner claims: “modifying the teaching of Lerner as taught by Cocotis in order to make sure LAN devices are secure by separating them from the Internet.” In fact, Applicant seeks to streamline “communication across enterprise firewalls” which “presents a problem for business process communications among applications in different enterprises” (see Applicant’s paragraph [0008]).

Claims 8-10 are dependent on claim 5 and are therefore not unpatentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 5 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

Similarly, Applicant’s the existing limitations of claim 18 allow claim 18 to overcome the cited Lerner reference. A fundamental difference between the cited Lerner “message broker in the “hub of the “hub and spoke” arrangement” and the Applicant’s claimed agent is that the latter is placed “as a spoke in a first hub and spoke integration system.” *See also Applicant’s paragraph [0022] and FIG. 1*, “the agents 102 and 112 are preferably configured as an adapter or spoke in the system.” Assuming, *arguendo*, that the “hub and spoke” model was conceptually the same in both Lerner and in Applicant’s claim 18, the

placement of the agent used for “receiving high level business data from a source application such as second application 114 and for transmitting the data for processing by a server” (i.e., the message broker component cited by Examiner’s at page 7) would be dissimilar and indeed foundationally irreconcilable. Thus, Lerner does not teach nor disclose the Applicant’s claim 18 limitation with regards to “a first agent acting as a spoke in a first hub and spoke integration system.” Applicant also resubmits that Lerner’s transmitted data is not “high-level *business data*” as limited by Applicant’s claim 18, but rather only an application’s flat text file output containing no “business information” as defined by the Applicant in paragraphs [0008] (i.e: “business information”).

Furthermore, Applicant’s limitation regarding a “using a first queue manager for decrypting the MQ message” is neither taught nor disclosed by Lerner. This is so given Lerner’s emphasis on the decryption of encrypted messages being performed by a “message queuing middleware at the central server which receives the message.” (See FIG. 7, col. 12, lines 40 – 67; see specifically col. 12, line 67 – “the encryption engine *at the central server*”). The applicant’s limitation with regards to a “queue manager for decrypting the message” is opposite the Lerner model in that the decrypting mechanism is placed in an MQ server *which is separate* from the central server as outlined in the Specification. (See Applicant’s paragraphs [0019] – [0022] – “the MQ server 110 acts a queue manager for receiving encrypted business data...message is relayed to the queue manager that decodes and decrypts the MQ message”). Thus, Applicant places the queue manager which decodes/decrypts the message in the MQ server, which is a distinct hardware component, separate from the central server.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of the claim 18 in view of Cocotis, Applicant resubmits that Cocotis does not teach or disclose the limitation "transmitting, *via the Internet using HTTP, and MQSeries Internet Passthrough* and through the firewalls at each end of the Internet, the encrypted MQ message to a first queue manager for retransmission at a time when the network is suitable for transporting the message to the server." Importantly, Cocotis discusses firewall pass-through *only through the use of a VPN proxy* switch (i.e: "routes the communications through a VPN switch that provides a secure pass-through through a firewall"). No such switch or VPN is claimed by Applicant. Instead, the encapsulation of data within HTTPS or SSL wrappers allows the data to pass unimpeded through a firewall (see Applicant's paragraph [0022] and paragraph [0026]) Further, Cocotis does not once make mention of the 'retransmission' limitation incorporated by Applicant and thus it differs from the current claim 18 limitations in that it does not account for network status or network correction logic (i.e: Applicant's determination of "a time when the network is suitable for transporting the message to the server).

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18 and thus includes the limitation described herein and is patentable over the cited references for at least the foregoing reasons.

Because the Examiner has based the rejection of claim 23 on a similar rationale as that of claim 5, Applicant hereby reincorporates and resubmits the above arguments made with respect to claim 5 as applicable to claim 23 and submits that given the substantive distinctions based on the cited Applicant's claim limitation, said arguments and limitations conclusively establish claim 23 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Thus, claim 23 and its dependent claims 24 and 25 are not unpatentable over the cited references.

Because the Examiner has based the rejection of claim 26 on a similar rationale as that of claim 5, Applicant hereby reincorporates and resubmits the above arguments made with respect to claim 5 as applicable to claim 26 and submits that given the substantive distinctions based on the cited Applicant's claim limitation, said arguments and limitations conclusively establish claim 26 is allowable over the cited prior art

Finally, because claims 27-30 are dependent on claim 26 they are therefore not unpatentable over the cited references.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, including any petition for extension of time fees under §1.17, to Deposit Account Number 09-0460.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner  
Reg. No. 33,162

E-filed on Date: September 10, 2010

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.  
8540 S.W. 83 Street  
Miami, Florida 33143  
(305) 273-8007 (voice)  
(305) 595-9579 (fax)